

Application No. 10/696,037  
Attorney Docket No.: 032054  
Response Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. Claims 3-12 are withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 2 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Liu** (U.S. Application Publication 2002/0050983) in view of **Adler** (U.S. Patent No. 6,630,929). Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that Liu in view of Adler does not teach or suggest:

a control section for controlling the wave number of the burst wave to be applied to said excitation section, based on the strength of surface acoustic waves measured by the measuring section

as recited in claim 1 and the method step as similarly recited in claim 13.

Liu describes a touch panel system comprising an excitation section and a receiving section both provided on a substrate for detecting a position of an object in contact with the substrate by propagation of surface acoustic waves (corresponding to the preamble part of claim 1 of the present invention).

The Office Action acknowledges that Liu does not disclose a control section for controlling the wave number of the burst wave to be applied to the excitation section, based on the strength of surface acoustic waves measured by said measuring section. (Office Action, page 2.) The Office Action cites Adler for disclosing this feature.

Adler describes controlling a characteristic frequency of the touchscreen and determining a burst length of a burst wave to be applied to a transducer. (*See* col. 8, lines 63-65.) However, Adler fails to disclose how to determine the burst length. Accordingly, the number of the burst

Application No. 10/696,037  
Attorney Docket No.: 032054  
Response Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

wave can be any value (for example, a predetermined value). Therefore, Adler fails to teach “controlling a wave number of a burst wave” as recited in claims 1 and 13.

For at least the foregoing reasons claims 1 and 13 are patentable over the cited references, and claim 2 is patentable by virtue of its dependence from claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 13 is hereby solicited.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that that the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,  
**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



Andrew G. Melick  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 56,868  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

AGM/adp